UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,493	06/14/2001	Pankaj K. Jha	0325.00482	7913

21363 7590 11/16/2005

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.
24840 HARPER SUITE 100
ST. CLAIR SHORES, MI 48080

EXAMINER	
PATEL, HARESH N	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2154	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/881,493	JHA, PANKAJ K.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 August 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *01 October 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are subject to examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 6/20/2005 and 11/24/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 1-20 is maintained.

Applicant argues (1), "cited reference Dietz et al. 6,665,725 (Hereinafter Dietz) expressly or inherently does not disclose a CAM storing pointers for parameters of a network protocol, as presently claimed". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, "a CAM storing pointers for parameters of a network protocol", are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is, "a database configured to store a pointer for each first parameter of a network protocol", see claim 1. Dietz discloses a database configured to store a pointer (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 –24, figure 15) for each first parameter of a network protocol (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 –24, figure 15), as claimed. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (2), "cited reference Dietz expressly or inherently does not disclose a network monitor processing parameters of incoming packets with a pointer stored in CAM, as

presently claimed". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, "a network monitor processing parameters of incoming packets with a pointer stored in CAM", are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is, "a processing circuit configured to process at least one of said first parameters an incoming packet in accordance with said pointer to produce a second parameter", see claim 1. Dietz discloses a processing circuit (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 – 57) configured to process at least one of said first parameters an incoming packet in accordance with said pointer to produce a second parameter (e.g., figure 16, col., 33, lines 16 – 34), as claimed. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (3), "cited reference Dietz expressly or inherently does not disclose a network monitor presenting an outgoing packet produced internally by the network monitor using a pointer from the CAM and an incoming packet, as presently claimed". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, "a network monitor presenting an outgoing packet produced internally by the network monitor using a pointer from the CAM and an incoming packet", are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of

the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is "to present an outgoing packet containing said second parameter", see claim 1. Dietz discloses limitations, to present an outgoing packet containing said second parameter a processing circuit (e.g., figure 16, col., 33, lines 51 – 67), as claimed. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (4), "cited reference Dietz expressly or inherently does not disclose a network monitor storing a pointer for parameters for a network protocol, as presently claimed". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, "network monitor storing a pointer for parameters for a network protocol", are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is, "a second circuit configured to store a pointer for each first parameter least one first parameter said network protocol", see claim 10. Dietz discloses a second circuit configured to store a pointer for each first parameter least one first parameter said network protocol (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 –24, col., 25, lines 41 – 57, figure 15), as claimed. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (5), "cited reference Dietz expressly or inherently does not disclose a network monitor processing parameters in accordance with a pointer stored in the network monitor to produce a second parameter, and the network monitor presenting an outgoing packet produced internally in accordance with a pointer stored in the network monitor and the incoming packet, as presently claimed". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, "network monitor processing parameters in accordance with a pointer stored in the network monitor to produce a second parameter, and the network monitor presenting an outgoing packet produced internally in accordance with a pointer stored in the network monitor and the incoming packet", are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is "process at least one of said first parameters in said incoming packet in accordance with said pointer to produce a second parameter, and to present an outgoing packet containing the second parameter", see claim 10. Dietz discloses process at least one of said first parameters in said incoming packet with said pointer to produce a second parameter (e.g., col., 32, line 50 – col., 33, line 14) and to present an outgoing packet containing the second parameter (e.g., col., 33, lines 51 – 67, col., 32, line 50 – col., 33, line 14, figure 16), as claimed. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (6), "cited reference Dietz expressly or inherently does not disclose an unidentified circuit framing an outgoing frame received from the network monitor to present a transmit frame to a second network, as presently claimed". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, "an unidentified circuit framing an outgoing frame received from the network monitor to present a transmit frame to a second network", are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is "a third circuit configured to frame said outgoing packet to present a transmit frame to a second network", see claim 10. Dietz discloses a third circuit configured to frame said outgoing packet to present a transmit frame to a second network (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 –24, col., 25, lines 41 - 57, figure 15), as claimed. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Response to Amendment

3. The amendment filed 8/22/2005 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

a. addition of limitations, "a pointer (single) for each of a plurality of first parameters", in claims 1 and 10,

b. addition of limitations, "an interface directly connected to said database and configured to download all of said offsets", in claim 3,

c. addition of limitations, "each configured to operate on a unique network protocol", in claims 18 and 19.

d. addition of limitations, "a fourth circuit connected to said second circuit and configured process at least one of said first parameters in said incoming packet in accordance with said pointer", in claim 20.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter, to avoid abandonment of this application, in the reply to this Office Action.

Specification

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The present title is not sufficient for proper classification of the claimed subject matter.

The following title is suggested: "An assembly for delineating a receive frame from one network to another network based on processing logic".

Drawings

5. New corrected drawings are required in this application because Figures 1-6, dated 6/14/2001 does not show claimed invention, "a circuit comprising a database to store a pointer

for each of a plurality of first parameters, incoming packet in accordance with said pointer to produce a second parameter and present an outgoing packet containing said second parameter, a first circuit, a second circuit (separate than first), a third circuit (separate than first and second) to frame outgoing packet to present a transmit frame, a fourth circuit (separate than first, second and third)". Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1, 10, 3, 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art to use and/or make the invention.

7. The specification does not contain subject matter to implement limitations, "a circuit (single) comprising a database and a processing circuit", "first parameters of a network protocol", "a pointer (single) for each of a plurality of first parameters", "second circuit (separate than first circuit)", "third circuit (separate than first and second circuits)", as cited in claims 1 and 10. Also, the specification, discloses an assembly (102) (not single circuit) comprising a database, see figure 2, first parameters of a packet (including data other than protocol information), (not a network protocol), see figure 5, and one pointer for each of the parameter, see figure 5.

8. The specification does not contain subject matter to implement limitations, "an interface directly connected to said database configured to download all of said offsets", as cited in claim 3. Also, the specification, discloses processing circuit between network interface and database, see figure 2. Also, the specification, does not disclose usage of "all of" as claimed.

9. The specification does not contain subject matter to implement limitations, "an interface directly connected to said database", as cited in claims 18 and 19. Also, the specification, discloses each pair of the framing circuits 186 and the de-framing circuit 188 (e.g., 186A-188A, 186B-188B) may be designed to operate on one or more network protocols, see page 21.

10. The specification does not contain subject matter containing any software or hardware to implement limitation "a fourth circuit connected to said second circuit and configured process at least one of said first parameters in said incoming packet in accordance with said pointer", as cited in claim 20. Also, the specification, does not disclose the fourth circuit as claimed.

Examiner has reviewed the specification (OCR whole document) and could not find support for the additional limitations as claimed.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 3 and 4 recite the limitations, "said pointers". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim (Please see MPEP 706.03(d). Note: claim 1 contains only one pointer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. Claims 1, 2, 4-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dietz et al., 6,665,725 (Hereinafter Dietz).

14. As per claims 1 and 10, Dietz teaches a circuit and an assembly as follows:

a database configured to store a pointer for each of a plurality (col., 9, lines 9 – 38) of first parameters (col., 10, lines 3 – 48) of a network protocol (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 –24, figure 15); and a processing circuit (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 – 57) configured to (i) process at least one of said first parameters an incoming packet in accordance with said pointer to produce a second parameter (e.g., col., 33, lines 16 – 34, figure 16) and (ii) present an outgoing packet containing said second parameter (e.g., col., 33, lines 51 – 67, figure 16),

first circuit configured to delineate a receive frame from a first network having a network protocol to produce incoming packet (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 – 57, figure 15);

an second circuit configured to (i) store a pointer for each of a plurality (col., 9, lines 9 – 38) of first parameters (col., 10, lines 3 – 48) of said network protocol (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 – 24, col., 25, lines 41 - 57, figure 15),

(ii) process at least one of said first parameters in said incoming packet in accordance with said pointer to produce a second parameter (e.g., col., 32, line 50 – col., 33, line 14), (iii) present process an outgoing packet containing said second parameter (e.g., figure 16, col., 33, lines 51 – 67, col., 32, line 50 – col., 33, line 14), and

a third circuit configured to frame said outgoing packet to present a transmit frame to a second network (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 –24, col., 25, lines 41 - 57, figure 15).

15. As per claim 2, Dietz teaches the following:

database is further configured to store an offset and a length for each of the said first parameters (e.g., col., 19, lines 1 – 23), and said processing circuit is further configured partition

said incoming packet accordance with both of said offsets and said lengths extract said first parameters (e.g., col., 19, lines 16 – 61).

16. As per claim 4, Dietz teaches the following:

a parsing circuit configured to partition said incoming packet (e.g., figure 15, col., 32, lines 7 – 16); a plurality of peripheral blocks (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 – 58) each coupled to said parsing circuit, linked to said pointers and configured to perform a process involving said first parameters and an assembling circuit coupled to said peripheral blocks (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 – 58) and configured to generate said outgoing packet (e.g., figures 15-18B, col., 33, lines 16 – 34).

17. As per claim 5, Dietz teaches the following:

database is further configured to store second offset (e.g., col., 19, lines 1 – 23), a second length for each said second parameter of a second network protocol (e.g., col., 19, lines 16 – 61).

18. As per claim 6, Dietz teaches the following:

an interface connectable to a peripheral block external to said circuit (e.g., figure 15, col., 25, lines 41 - 57).

19. As per claim 7, Dietz teaches the following:

peripheral blocks are at least two circuits of addressable memory circuit, a parity circuit, a first-in-first-out circuit, time to live circuit, content comparison counter circuit, a value

swapping circuit, a stuffing de-stuffing circuit, a cyclic redundancy checksum length construction generator circuit, synchronization circuit, a frame relay lookup circuit, a data link header error control connection identifier circuit, a protocol identification analysis circuit, a point-to-point protocol verification circuit, parameter discard circuit, and a buffer circuit (e.g., col., 25, lines 3 – 38).

20. As per claim 8, Dietz teaches the following:

said peripheral blocks are configured to simultaneously processes a plurality of said first parameters (e.g., col., 6, lines 1 – 15).

21. As per claim 9, Dietz teaches the following:

processing circuit is implemented as only hardware (e.g., col., 25, lines 8 – 38).

22. As per claim 11, Dietz teaches the following:

wherein said second circuit is further configured to store both an offset and a length (e.g., col., 19, lines 1 – 23) for each of said first parameters and partition said incoming packet (e.g., col., 19, lines 16 – 61) in accordance with both of said offsets and said lengths (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 –24, col., 25, lines 41 - 57, figure 15) to extract said first parameters from said incoming packet (e.g., figure 15, col., 32, lines 7 – 16).

23. As per claim 12, Dietz teaches the following:

wherein said first circuit is further configured to provided a plurality of frame delineation methods (e.g, col., 25, lines 41 - 57, figure 15, col., 6, line 62 - col., 7, line 24, col., 8, lines 54 - 65) for a plurality of network protocols (e.g., figures 15, 17A, 18A, col., 21, lines 11-24, col., 6, lines 15 - 22, lines 44 - 54).

24. As per claim 13, Dietz teaches the following:

further comprising an interface (e.g, col., 25, lines 41 - 57, figure 11 and 15, col., 8, line 58 - col., 9, line 24) configured to permit a selection among said frame delineation methods (e.g, col., 33, lines 16 - 34, col., 6, line 62 - col., 7, line 24, col., 8, lines 54 - 65, figure 16).

25. As per claim 14, Dietz teaches the following:

said second circuit (e.g., figures 11 and 15, col., 21, lines 11 -24, col., 25, lines 41 - 57, col., 8, line 58 - col., 9, line 24) is further configured to provided a plurality of framing methods (e.g., col., 25, lines 4 - 57, col., 6, line 62 - col., 7, line 24, col., 8, lines 54 -65) for a plurality of network protocols (e.g., figures 15, 17A, 18A, col., 21, lines 11 -24, col., 6, lines 15 - 22, lines 44 - 54).

26. As per claim 15, Dietz teaches the following:

further comprising an interface (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 - 57, figures 11 and 15, col., 8, line 58 - col., 9, line 24) configured to permit a selection among said framing methods (e.g., col., 33, lines 16 - 34col., 6, line 62 - col., 7, line 24, col., 8, lines 54 - 65).

27. As per claim 16, Dietz teaches the following:

said third circuit (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 - 24, col., 25, lines 41 - 57, figures 11 and 15, col., 8, line 58 - col., 9, line 24) is further configured to delineate a second receive frame (e.g., col., 32, line 50 - col., 33, line 14, blocks 206 - 208, figure 2) from said second network (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 - 24, col., 25, lines 41 - 57, figures 15, 17A, 18A, col., 6, lines 15 -22, lines 44 - 54) to produce said incoming packet (e.g., col., 9, lines 28 - 41).

28. As per claim 17, Dietz teaches the following:

said first circuit is further configured to frame (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 -57, col., 33, lines 51 - 67, col., 32, lines 50 - col., 33, line 14, col., 6, line 62 - col., 7, line 24, col., 8, lines 54 -65) said outgoing packet (e.g., col., 30, lines 11 - 24, col., 10 , lines 11 - 28) to present a second transmit frame (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 -57, col., 33, lines 51 - 67, col., 32, lines 50 - col., 33, line 14, col., 6, line 62 - col., 7, line 24, col., 8, lines 54 -65) to said first network (e.g., figures 15, 17A, 18A, col., 21, lines 11 -24, col., 6, lines 15 - 22, lines 44 - 54).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

29. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

30. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz in view of "Official Notice"

31. As per claim 3, Dietz teaches the following:

an interface configured to download all of said offsets, said lengths, and said pointers for storage in said database (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 – 57).

However, Dietz does not specifically mention about the interface directly connected to the database. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing the interface directly connected to the database is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the interface directly connected to the database with the teachings of Dietz in order to facilitate the interface directly connected to the database because the direct connection would avoid interference of the additional devices connected between the interface and the database. The connection between two circuits would provide communication between two devices.

32. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz in view of Ogawa et al. 5,936,966 (Hereinafter Ogawa) and Gabrick et al., 2002/0161802 (Hereinafter Gabrick).

33. As per claim 18, Dietz teaches the claimed limitation as rejected under claim 10.

However, Dietz does not specifically mention about a plurality of framing circuits.

Ogawa discloses a plurality of framing circuits (e.g., use of several circuits for framing, col., 3, lines 44 – 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dietz with the teachings of Ogawa in order to facilitate usage of a plurality of framing circuits means because the framing circuits would enhance the

handling the information associated with the packet, and the packet related information would help enhance the software to process information for the assembly.

Dietz and Ogawa do not specifically mention about usage of a unique network protocol.

Gabrick discloses a concept of using a unique network protocol (e.g., use of several circuits for framing, col., 3, lines 44 – 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dietz and Ogawa with the teachings of Gabrick in order to facilitate usage of a unique network protocol because the unique network protocol would support replicating and transferring information between two entities. The replication and transferring information would support providing information to the network device.

34. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz in view of Wilford et al. 6,687,247 (Hereinafter Wilford) and Gabrick.

35. As per claim 19, Dietz teach the claimed limitation as rejected under claim 10.

However, Dietz does not specifically mention about a plurality of de-framing circuits.

Wilford discloses a plurality of de-framing circuits (e.g., use of several circuits for deframing, col., 2, lines 59 – col., 3, line 18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dietz with the teachings of Wilford in order to facilitate usage of a plurality of de-framing circuits means because the de-framing circuits would enhance the handling the information associated with the packet, and the packet related information would help enhance the software to process information for the assembly.

Dietz and Wilford do not specifically mention about usage of a unique network protocol.

Gabrick discloses a concept of using a unique network protocol (e.g., use of several circuits for framing, col., 3, lines 44 – 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dietz and Ogawa with the teachings of Wilford in order to facilitate usage of a unique network protocol because the unique network protocol would support replicating and transferring information between two entities. The replication and transferring information would support providing information to the network device.

36. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz in view of Yanagihara et al. 5,899,578 (Hereinafter Yanagihara).

37. As per claim 20, Dietz teach the claimed limitation as rejected under claim 10.

However, Dietz does not specifically mention about a fourth circuit connected to the second circuit and configured process at least one of the first parameters.

Yanagihara discloses a fourth circuit connected to the second circuit (e.g., figure 10 A) and configured process at least one of the first parameters (e.g., col., 1, lines 51 - 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dietz with the teachings of Yanagihara in order to facilitate usage of a fourth circuit connected to the second circuit and configured process at least one of the first parameters because the additional circuit would enhance the handling the information associated with the packet, and the packet related information would help enhance

the software to process information for the assembly. The connection between two circuits would provide communication between two devices.

Conclusion

38. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

November 11, 2005

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100